

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Christopher Lane,	)	C/A No. 0:20-2725-RBH-PJG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
(First Name Unknown) Kimbrell, <i>Corporal</i> ;	)	
(First Name Unknown) Palmer, <i>Deputy</i>	)	
<i>Warden</i> ; David Harouff, <i>Captain/Unit</i>	)	
<i>Manager of D Dorm</i> ; (First Name Unknown)	)	
Harper, <i>QMHP</i> ; Willie Davis, <i>Reg Director</i> ;	)	
Kameron Love, <i>Sgt.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

The plaintiff has filed this action, *pro se*, seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff, an inmate with the South Carolina Department of Corrections, alleges violations of his constitutional rights by the named defendants. Defendants Harouff, Palmer, and Harper filed a motion to dismiss on October 29, 2020, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 38.) As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court entered an order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), on October 30, 2020, advising the plaintiff of the importance of a motion to dismiss and of the need for him to file an adequate response. (ECF No. 41.) The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, the defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending his case against those defendants.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's Roseboro order, the plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action as to Defendants Harouff, Palmer, and Harper.

Based on the foregoing, it is

**ORDERED** that the plaintiff shall advise the court as to whether he wishes to continue with this case against Defendants Harouff, Palmer, and Harper and to file a response to the defendants' motion to dismiss within fourteen (14) days from the date of this order. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, **this action will be recommended for dismissal as to these defendants with prejudice for failure to prosecute.** See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

December 14, 2020  
Columbia, South Carolina

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paige J. Gossett  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE